

## REMARKS

Claims 1-60 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 23, and 42 being the independent claims. In summary of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Charisius et al United States Patent number 7,055,130 herein referred to as “Charisius.” Claims 1 – 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, and 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being directed towards unpatentable subject matter and as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Applicants herein amend claims 1, 15, 16, 23 – 41, and 58 - 60, cancel claims 21, and 42 -57, and present new claims 61 - 76. No new matter is added. As a result claims 1 -20, 22 – 41, 58 – 60, and 61 – 76 are pending. Further examination and review in view of the amendments and remarks blow are respectfully requested.

### *Objections to the Specification*

The use of various trademarks in the application have been objected to by the Examiner. Applicants have amended the specification and Applicants respectfully submit that the objection is overcome.

### *Telephonic Interview*

On March 29, 2007, the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner. As a preliminary matter, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the interview. During the interview, the objections to the specification, the claims, and the prior art of record were discussed. The Examiner’s helpful comments have led the undersigned to submit the following remarks.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101*

Claims 1-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly claims an abstract idea. Without conceding that the claims are directed towards an abstract idea Applicants have amended claims 1, 15, 16, 23 – 41, and 58 - 60, and canceled claims 21, and 42 -57.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome with respect to claims 1, 15, 16, 23 – 41, and 58 – 60, and moot with respect to claims 21, and 42 -57.

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Without conceding that the claims are directed towards an abstract idea Applicants have amended claims 1, 15, 16, 23 – 41, and 58 - 60, and canceled claims 21, and 42 -57. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome with respect to claims 1, 15, 16, 23 – 41, and 58 – 60, and moot with respect to claims 21, and 42 -57.

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

Claim 1 recites in part:

utilizing an explicit interface member mechanism that enables at least one software component to implement at least one explicit interface member by explicitly specifying the relationship between said at least one software component and the at least one explicit interface member; and

storing said at least one component in a form that includes said implemented at least one explicit interface member in a computer readable storage medium.

Applicants submit that claim 1 patentably defines over Charisius for at least the following reasons. For example, claim 1 recites “utilizing an explicit interface member mechanism that *enables* at least one software component to *implement* at least *one explicit interface member* by explicitly specifying the relationship between said at least one software component and the at least one interface member.” (emphasis added). The Examiner stated in an Office Action dated January 23, 2007 that figures 5, 18-19, column 18, table 18 [sic], lines 39-50, column 19, table 17, lines 51-67, column 22, lines 62-67, and column 23, lines 1-

8 anticipate claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the above referenced portions of Charisius fail to teach claim 1 as recited.

Applicants submit that Fig. 5 of Charisius fails to teach or suggest the recited elements of claim 1. For example, Fig. 5 depicts a “UserInterface 402 ... defined as a package 404. Accordingly, UserInterface 402 is contained in SCI package 502. Similarly, Bank 406, which is defined as a class 408, is contained in SCI class 504, and Name 410 and Assets 412, which are defined as attributes (strings 414), are contained in SCI members 506. Since these elements are in the same project, all are linked. The data structure 500 also identifies the language in which the source code is written 508, e.g., the Java® language.” Applicants submit that Fig. 5 fails to teach or suggest the recited “utilizing an explicit interface member mechanism that *enables* at least one software component to *implement* at least *one explicit interface member* by explicitly specifying the relationship between said at least one software component and the at least one interface member” of Applicants’ claim 1.

Applicants additionally submit that claim 1 patentably defines over Fig. 18 and 19 as well. Fig. 18 depicts “packages of classes and the dependencies among them” (Charisius, col. 22, lines 62-67), and Fig. 19 illustrates “providing a visual cue of multiple dependencies between two nodes in a project ... each node... may be... an interface.” (Charisius, col. 23, lines 18-23). These figures illustrate a developer tool that depicts the *dependencies* between interfaces whereas claim 1 recites an “explicit interface member mechanism that *enables* at least one software component to *implement* at least *one explicit interface member* by explicitly specifying the relationship between said at least one software component and the at least one interface member.”(emphasis added).

Moreover claim 1 patentably defines over tables 14 and 19. Tables 14 and 19 depict example audits performed by a quality assurance module. This module checks for conformance to language style rules. The audit depicted by table 14 only “checks whether top level classes or interfaces have the same name as the file in which they reside.”(Charisius, column 18, table 14, lines 39-50). Similarly the audit depicted by table 19 only depicts an audit that checks for duplicate import declaration statements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the above stated portions of Charisius fail to teach or suggest the recited elements of Applicants’ claim 1 and request reconsideration of the rejection.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0573 / 160076.01  
**Application No.:** 09/900,123  
**Office Action Dated:** January 23, 2007

**PATENT**

With respect to claims 2 – 14 applicants submit that since they incorporate by reference all the limitations of claim 1 they are patentably distinct from Charisius. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections.

Independent claim 23 and newly presented claim 61 recite similar elements to that of claim 1 and are patentably distinct from Charisius for at least the same reason with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 24- 41, and 58 – 60, 62 - 76 depend directly or indirectly from claims 23 or 61 they also patentably define over Charisius. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and request that claim 61 and its depending claims be placed in a condition of allowance.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections to the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Date: April 23, 2007

/David M. Platz/  
David M. Platz  
Registration No.60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439